REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5-15 are pending in the application and are rejected. Claim 1 is herein amended. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 2 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner notes that the claims now require that glass particles are mixed only to the primer layer with a ratio of glass particles to the top layer having a weight ratio of less than 3% or glass particles are mixed to both the primer and top layer with a ratio of the glass particles to the top layer having a weight ratio of less than 3%. However, the Examiner asserts that the original disclosure does not have support for the claimed weight ratio of glass particles in only the primer layer, and there is no support in the original disclosure of glass particles in only the primer layer having a weight ratio to the top layer of less than 3%.

The Examiner notes that the specification on page 7, lines 1-2 and 10-11 indicates that the second embodiment is described with glass particles mixed into only the primer layer in a weight ratio of 30%. The Examiner asserts that there is no mention that the 30% weight ratio is to the weight ratio to the "top layer". The Examiner notes that the specification on page 8, lines 2-3 indicates that the third embodiment is described where glass particles are mixed into both the primer layer and the top layer in a weight ratio of 30%. The Examiner asserts that there is no mention that the 30% weight ratio is to the weight ratio to the "top layer". Page 13, lines 11-12 and 14-15 of the original disclosure also describes that mixing ratios of the glass particles to be mixed to the primer layer be prepared by 30% in weight %. The Examiner asserts that there is

no support in the original disclosure of glass particles mixed only to the primer layer with a weight ratio of less than 3% to the top layer. The Examiner asserts that there is also no support in the original disclosure with glass particles mixed to both the primer layer and the top layer with a weight ratio of less than 3% to the top layer. Finally, the Examiner asserts that there is no support in the original disclosure for the limitation "wherein a ratio of said glass particles to the top layer is a weight ratio of less than 3%".

Applicant partially agrees with the Examiner's assertions. Applicant notes that in claim 1, in either alternative condition, the limitation that the glass fibers are present in the weight ratio of 3% to the top layer does not appear to be supported.

Nevertheless, with the most recent amendment to the claim requiring that the glass particles are mixed into either

said primer layer, **or**

said primer layer **and** said top layer,

Applicant notes that the recited amounts of glass particles are no longer necessary to patentably distinguish over the cited references. Although the Examiner has maintained a rejection of claim 2, Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that the glass fibers being in the primer layer is not obvious over Matsuyama.

Applicant herein amends claim 1 to remove the limitation as to the amount of glass fibers, so the present rejection over §112 should be overcome and the claim and its progeny should be allowed.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that the limitations of claims 2 and 5 are redundant to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 1 properly claims one of two alternative limitations, that the glass particles are included in either

said primer layer, **or**

said primer layer **and** said top layer.

Applicant notes that either of these conditions would satisfy the claim. Applicant submits that claims 2 and 5 are properly worded to properly narrow claim 1 to either the first or second alternatives of claim 1, respectively. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that claim 6 is unclear because in claim 1 if only the primer layer having glass particles is chosen, the top layer does not have glass particles as recited in claim 6.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, because the alternative set forth by the Examiner, i.e., if only the primer layer has glass particles, is not possible. Claim 6 is dependent from claim 5, which specifies that glass particles are mixed into both the primer layer and the top layer. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because it is quite clear.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Kenneth H. Salen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,077
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

KHS/lde